

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE

February 2, 2016

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

| | |
|---|----|
| Opening..... | 1 |
| Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement..... | 2 |
| HAB Report Summary..... | 4 |
| Public Involvement Principles | 6 |
| HAB Member Sharing/HAB 101..... | 8 |
| 100 D/H Proposed Plan..... | 9 |
| Hanford Advisory Board Member Self –Assessments | 10 |
| Committee Business..... | 12 |
| Attachments | 13 |
| Attendees | 14 |

This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Committee members adopted the November 2015 PIC meeting summary.

Announcements

Liz highlighted that there would be an upcoming public meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 4 regarding the scope of the Manhattan Project National Historic Park, part of which is located on the Hanford Site. She encouraged interested PIC members to attend.

Susan Leckband, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) vice chair, shared that she had recently read the book *Girls of Atomic City*, a novel set at the Oak Ridge Site in Tennessee. She highly recommended it for interested PIC members.

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), opened the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Public Involvement Planning meeting segment, noting that for the first time, the meeting would be incorporated as a part of the PIC agenda. Dieter invited HAB members and other attendees to provide the TPA agency Public Information Officers with any suggestions or feedback regarding the format of future Quarterly Planning Meetings.

*Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Calendar*¹

Dieter provided attendees with the TPA public involvement calendar, updated for February 2016. Dieter noted that the TPA agencies recently reorganized the calendar so that it was more accessible to web users. Dieter highlighted that the calendar is available [online](#). He also noted that Ecology recently linked the public involvement calendar to their Nuclear Waste Program home page to improve ease of access.

Dieter walked attendees through ongoing public comment periods. He noted that the level of public involvement associated with various permit updates was tied to the significance of the modifications, with Class Three changes denoted being the most impactful. Dieter reminded committee members that any Class Three permit modification required two public comment periods—an initial, 60-day comment period initiated by the permittee, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), and a follow-up 45-day comment period initiated by the regulator.

Dieter stated that the TPA agencies anticipated upcoming comment periods related to:

- River Corridor 100 D/H Area Proposed Plans
- Ventilation upgrades and grouting hot cells at the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility
- Closure of parts of T-Plant, Central Waste Complex (CWC)/Waste Receiving and Processing Facility, and Trenches 31 & 34

Dieter said that the TPA agencies originally anticipated that the comment period regarding the 100 D/H Proposed Plan would occur early in calendar year 2016; however, he noted that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requested that additional work be done on the Proposed Plan before its release. Dieter recognized that the U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations (DOE-RL) would likely release the Proposed Plan sometime in summer 2016.

Dieter stated that the revisions to the Hanford Site-Wide Permit (Rev 9) were ongoing, and, at the request of PIC members, the Site Wide Permit would remain in the holding bin of the TPA agency Public Involvement Calendar. Dieter noted that Ecology was continuing to work with DOE regarding potential updates to the Site Wide Permit and once Rev 9 updates were finalized, the TPA agencies would do public involvement.

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016 (February 2016)

Kris Holmes, DOE-RL, noted that a comment period on the 2016 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report (Lifecycle Report) would open February 22, 2016. She said that the comment period would remain open until April 15, 2016, and she encouraged HAB members to look into the 2016 Lifecycle Report fact sheet and provide DOE-RL with feedback.

Kris also highlighted that DOE-RL would likely release close-out documentation in the coming months regarding closed comment periods for the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility in-trench macroencapsulation permit waiver and the proposed changes to TPA milestone series M-091. Kris also said that DOE-RL planned to release the Explanation of Significant Difference for transporting K Basin sludge to T-Plant in spring 2016.

Sharon Braswell, NorthWind supporting U.S. Department of Energy—Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), noted that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP would likely hold a public budget meeting on March 15, 2016, following the release of the President's Budget for FY 2017. Sharon encouraged the Board and members of the public to consider budget priorities and provide comment to DOE offices following the upcoming budget meeting.

TPA agency representatives also highlighted tentative plans for holding regional State of the Hanford Site public meetings; representatives noted that these meetings would likely occur in early calendar year 2017.

Committee Questions and Responses ²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. There is a 45-day public comment period on proposed changes to the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) permit relating to the design of the Low Activity Waste facility. Is this potential design change something that the Board should weigh-in on?

R. [Ecology] The proposed changes to the design of the WTP do not fall into the framework of Class One, Two, or Three permit modifications; however, there is a required 45-day comment period for these proposed changes. TPA agencies would not anticipate that the Board would need to weigh-in on these changes. Following the 45-day comment period (scheduled to end on February 13, 2016), Ecology will determine whether or not additional public feedback is needed on the topic.

Q. How do the various HAB committees know which comment periods to track and which topics may require Board input?

R. [Ecology] The TPA agencies continually report on the status of anticipated and upcoming comment periods at HAB committee meetings. If committee members feel that the Board needs to provide input on a topic, they have the opportunity to plan and prepare with agency liaisons.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

C. Ecology highlighted that upcoming closures of parts of T-Plant, CWC, and Trenches 31 & 34 will be done in batches. It would help HAB members and the public comment on these potential closures more effectively if they were mapped out and described in simple, plain language. This would allow the public to identify the most important items for comment.

Q. Does the 2016 Lifecycle Report incorporate financial data for all of fiscal year (FY) 2015?

R. [DOE-ORP] No, the Lifecycle Report incorporates financial information through the end of August 2015.

C. Information presented at past DOE public budget workshops was confusing; the three-year federal budget cycle is often difficult for the public to understand. DOE-RL and DOE-ORP should work with PIC members to plan meeting strategies that will make the information more approachable for members of the public.

Q. Will DOE-ORP's presented FY 2018 budget proposal include detailed budget numbers?

R. [DOE-ORP] No, DOE-ORP will present priorities as opposed to detailed budget numbers. DOE-ORP will always submit a compliant budget. DOE-ORP is very interested in hearing whether the Board and the public believe that the agency's priorities are appropriately targeted.

C. Members of the public and the HAB should not let a lack of detailed budget information from DOE-ORP influence their willingness to provide comment. This is important detail for agencies to have as they forward budget requests to DOE headquarters.

Q. How do public comments inform the budget requests of DOE offices?

R. [DOE-ORP] All public comments, including any Board advice, are forwarded to DOE headquarters along with budget requests.

Attendees thanked TPA agency representatives for the information. PIC members noted that they appreciated incorporating the TPA Quarterly Planning Meeting into the PIC meeting, and they recommended that the strategy continue.

HAB Report Summary

Liz Mattson opened committee discussion on a potential new strategy that could allow HAB members to track relevant reports, articles, and publications more effectively. She introduced Gary Garnant, who would serve as lead issue manager for compiling information and creating summary documents for select, relevant topics.

Gary noted that he worked as a technical writer at Hanford's 300 Area, and he said that he often reads and synthesizes reports that are germane to ongoing HAB work. Gary offered to continue to track documents, and he encouraged PIC members to discuss this strategy and provide feedback if this report summary would be useful to them as a Board member.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. This is a good strategy for tracking reports pertinent to HAB and committee work, such as those released by the U.S. Government Accountability Office. Gary often tracks these documents, and compiling reports would be a strategy that could allow the Board to better track new and emerging information from non-TPA agencies

C. If the Board were to consider this as a strategy for tracking relevant reports and documents on an ongoing basis, summaries and documents Gary could upload the reports to the HAB's SharePoint Site. Handouts could be made available at Board meetings that identify what documents were updated on the SharePoint Site between Boards meetings.

R. It would be important for members to receive some kind of running update as to the documents that are compiled and available. It would be difficult for Board members to simply search through documents to discover what updates were made to the report library.

C. If the committee decides to move forward with this strategy of tracking documents, issue managers need to be mindful of documents that may incorporate bias—especially if these documents will be uploaded to the HAB's SharePoint Site. Bias in report selection and summarization may come across as fact or as the entire Board taking a position on a controversial issue.

R. Issue managers would need to vet documents before posting them. Perhaps issue managers could also incorporate a document rating system into the process? This is something that PIC members and issue managers could explore in further detail during future discussions.

R. Every document produced relating to Hanford Site cleanup has some form of bias. If the Board were to simply recognize this as an unavoidable aspect of compiling documents and reports, it should not be a major issue. Past reports that Gary has reviewed and summarized have been of high quality and from sound sources; and the SharePoint library could simply include a disclaimer highlighting that documents and summaries are purely for information-sharing purposes.

C. The reports that Gary and other issue managers focus on should track closely with topics incorporated into the work plan that TPA agencies and the Board have agreed upon.

C. The issue managers working with the facilitation team could provide the agencies with a courtesy review of all documents prior to their posting on the SharePoint Site.

PIC members agreed that this was a good strategy for tracking information and one that could assist Board members in their work. Members agreed to continue planning strategies for implementing these reports during upcoming PIC discussions.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Public Involvement Principles

Liz Mattson noted that recent discussions in the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) had identified the potential need for advice on overarching public involvement principles as they relate to Hanford Site public engagement opportunities. Liz identified that HAB Advice #239 (Incorporating Public Involvement Strategic Planning into the Community Relations Plan), adopted in 2010, was the last piece of public involvement advice that the Board considered. Liz noted that HAB Advice #239 took the Board and agencies over a year to conceptualize and draft, and she said that it highlighted definitions and goals for public involvement.

Liz cited recent Board conversations that highlighted frustration with the timing of recent public comment periods and a perceived lack of approachable information. Liz requested that committee members identify and discuss the need for updated HAB public involvement advice and identify issue managers for the topic as needed.

Committee Questions and Responses ²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. How would an updated piece of HAB advice differ from past advice?

R. HAB Advice #239 was comprehensive and clear; however, it reads as a set of public involvement principles, not public involvement goals. Advice #239 reads as the “what” of public involvement planning, new advice could potentially be the “how.”

Q. Do PIC members feel that the Hanford Public Involvement Plan is sound?

R. The Hanford Public Involvement Plan provides good guidelines; however, it seems to ascribe a “one size fits all” approach to public involvement. The Board could advise TPA agencies to tailor public involvement strategies more depending on the needs of individual meetings and comment periods.

R. TPA agency public involvement has not failed; however, the agencies could have been done better implementing it at times.

Q. Do the agencies feel that specific public involvement advice would be useful at this time?

R. [Ecology] Public involvement regulations and requirements have not changed, so TPA agencies know what steps are required for public involvement efforts. In most cases, agencies go above and beyond required steps and tailor public involvement work to the specific needs of a topic, including the incorporation of simple, approachable language. If advice simply encourage TPA agencies to incorporate these existing strategies, it would likely not precipitate any changes to upcoming public involvement efforts.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. [DOE-ORP] Agencies currently strive to meet all of the points that the Board highlighted in HAB Advice #239.

C. How do agencies ensure that language included in Hanford Site mailings and presentations is clear and approachable? Is there a dedicated office that reviews the language before it is disseminated to the public?

R. [DOE-ORP] TPA agencies often share outreach materials with one another to ensure accuracy and clarity. The State of Oregon is often included, as well.

C. There are two audiences that Hanford Site public involvement needs to account for—those individuals who are already educated in Hanford terminology and issues and those who are unfamiliar with them. Public involvement efforts should strive to ensure that both groups are included and involved.

C. One challenge that is associated with presenting information on a complex topic (e.g. the recent TPA milestone series change package) is that it is inherently complex. There are often technical, policy, and legal issues that need to be covered, and oversimplifying the conversation could present additional barriers to understanding.

R. [Ecology] The legal requirement for public involvement associated with the recent TPA milestone series change package was a 45-day comment period. The agencies listened to Board feedback and extended the comment period twice, as well as traveled throughout the region to hold public meetings. TPA agencies strive to be responsive to Board requests for enhanced public involvement, and the agencies distilled the information to allow for general public understanding.

Q. Should the Board continue to include specific public involvement advice points within technical advice?

R. Yes. It is often helpful information to package with technical advice. The Board does not have to provide extremely detailed public involvement advice points in these cases, but they are often helpful goals and reminders for Board members and TPA agencies alike.

C. [DOE-ORP] If the Board were to consider authoring an additional piece of advice on public involvement, it could highlight existing strategies that the Board believes are effective. TPA agencies would find this detail to be extremely helpful, and it would allow us to appropriately target future involvement efforts.

C. As a next step, issue managers could review all Board products, including advice and white papers, from the past five to six years and identify all points associated with public involvement. Trends in these advice points may highlight opportunities for a future Board product.

C. The Board could potentially look to codify best public involvement practices based on the Class of the permit modification.

C. [DOE-ORP] In 2002, PIC members authored a white paper evaluating public involvement. A review of HAB products could also incorporate information from this document, as TPA agencies still reference it during public involvement planning.

PIC members decided to examine existing advice, white papers, and the Hanford Public Involvement Plan as a next step. Issue managers would review these documents and identify trends in preparation for discussions as upcoming PIC meetings.

HAB Member Sharing/HAB 101

Liz Mattson encouraged PIC members and TPA agency representatives to discuss the ways that committee members share information with stakeholders and members of the public. In particular, Liz encouraged members to highlight useful strategies for conveying stakeholder questions and concerns to TPA agency representatives through Board discussions and products.

Agency Perspective

Sharon Braswell, NorthWind supporting DOE-ORP, noted that TPA agencies were interested in hearing more from Board members about the views, perspectives, and questions that they hear from constituents and members of the public. Sharon said that DOE-ORP had recently shared information with the Tank Waste Committee regarding the Low-Activity Waste Pretreatment System (LAWPS). She highlighted these briefings as an example, noting that DOE-ORP would be curious to hear about how Board members shared this information about LAWPS with members of the public and what questions or concerns members of the public then shared with them.

Committee Questions and Responses ²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. PIC members convey recent engagement efforts and conversations during the standing HAB member self-assessment portion of the PIC meetings. During future HAB member self-assessments, members could potentially place a higher degree of focus on feedback that they receive from stakeholders.

R. [DOE-ORP] This would be useful information for the agencies to have. If HAB member self-assessments could be expanded to note key questions, points of discussion, and perspectives of constituents, event attendees, or interested parties, that would allow TPA agencies to better respond to public concerns during outreach efforts. Board members should think about this next time they are engaging in outreach with their group. Any takeaway messages or feedback that Board members are comfortable sharing with PIC members and TPA agency representatives would be very helpful.

C. One of the basic rules of the Board is that only the chair speaks on the Board's behalf. HAB members need to keep this in mind. However, this rule speaks to how Board members share information, not to the information that they are able to share with the public.

C. As many Board members also work on Hanford issues in their roles outside of the HAB, it may be difficult for them to keep their roles distinct during conversations with members of the public.

R. As members of a Federal Advisory Committee Act Board, HAB members function as a feedback loop. Members provide information to the public, and they also have the ability to convey feedback from their constituencies to agencies. Does the Board have effective processes in place to convey feedback from constituencies to TPA agencies? If not, what could be done to strengthen this loop?

R. Enhanced feedback loops are also beneficial to demonstrate the effectiveness and relevance of the HAB overall.

C. If Board members are effectively representing their constituencies, then TPA agencies are already receiving this information as Board members ask questions and provide their own perspectives during committee and Board meetings. It is dependent upon how HAB members view their role as representatives.

PIC members noted that they would continue the discussion and brainstorm potential strategies for sharing public feedback with TPA agencies. Committee members also noted that they would work to convey this information in more detail during standing HAB member self-assessments.

100 D/H Proposed Plan

Liz Mattson noted that RAP members received a presentation on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan in December 2015. She noted that many of the River Corridor cleanup plans incorporated intermediate actions, which contributed to general confusion about remaining cleanup work at many of these sites (100 D/H in particular). Liz raised concerns that members of the public may be confused when the 100 D/H Proposed Plan moves out for public review and comment. She suggested that the TPA agencies could develop public outreach materials that would provide the public with a history of cleanup work in 100 D/H Area, highlight completed interim actions, and call out all remaining work. Liz noted concerns that the 100 D/H Proposed Plan was complex, and that the public may not be able to provide effective comment if they were not presented with clear information.

Liz encouraged committee members to discuss potential public involvement needs associated with the release of the 100 D/H Proposed Plan, reminding committee members that the Plan's release was pushed back until summer 2016.

Committee Questions and Responses ²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. It would be helpful if DOE-RL could create an accessible, digital presentation that the public could explore and that would provide them with information on work that has been done, completed interim action, and work that is still remaining. This would allow members of the public to attend public meetings with a more complete understanding of what they are commenting on.

Q. Would the Board produce this presentation?

R. No. Board members would request that DOE create the presentation and make it available on their website.

C. The history of 100 D/H is long and complex, and it would be difficult to distill all of the requested information into a fact sheet.

R. DOE could best present this information as a digital, web-based presentation. The goal of the presentation would be to preempt the public comment period and adequately prepare people to appropriately frame the 100 D/H Proposed Plan once released for public review.

C. [Ecology] Agencies could work with issue managers to better frame this potential product in time for further discussion and clarification at the PIC's April 2016 meeting.

Committee members thanked TPA agency representatives for their willingness to collaborate on this potential informational product. Liz noted that the PIC meeting in April 2016 would be a timely opportunity to discuss this potential item in further detail and begin to prepare for the potential summer 2016 release of the 100 D/H Proposed Plan.

Hanford Advisory Board Member Self –Assessments

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters, said that she had recently met with some directors of her organization and discussed Hanford issues with them. She noted that they expressed concerns regarding schedule delays incorporated into the recently proposed TPA milestone change package primarily regarding the lack of adequate funding. Susan noted that she would work with DOE to potentially identify opportunities for the agency to present at a future League of Women Voters meeting.

Kris Holmes, DOE-RL, said that the agency was continuing to participate in speaking events throughout the region, citing the University of Washington's College of Occupational Health Sciences and the American Society of Civil Engineers as upcoming events. Kris noted that speakers from DOE-RL are often members of the management team, and that the agency caters speaker expertise to the specific needs of the organization.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, noted that speakers from Ecology were presenting to Rotary Clubs throughout the region. He also identified that Ecology representatives were recently targeting speaking opportunities at community college Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) programs. Dieter noted that MESA programs represent a new opportunity for Ecology representatives to interact with educationally and economically disadvantaged students throughout the area.

Jan Catrell, public-at-large, noted that she often works to share the Hanford story with community members in Bellingham, Washington, at a high level. She noted that members of her community are often interested in the ideas associated with vitrifying tank waste, as well as the recent DOE and U.S. Department of the Interior efforts to create the Manhattan Project National Historic Park. Jan noted that she reached out to school districts in Bellingham to explore potential partnerships, and she also noted that she planned to coordinate with Ecology representatives and submit an application to Western Washington University's Academy of Lifelong Learning.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), said that he continues to present at colleges and universities throughout Oregon. He noted that he receives a wide variety of questions following these presentations, but they most often focus on the large amount of work that remains at the Hanford Site. Ken stated that he will meet with the Oregon congressional delegation in Washington, D.C. in March 2016 and discuss Hanford cleanup. He also noted that his agency will talk to a State of Oregon legislative committee regarding a potential restructuring of ODOE, and he stated that TPA agency representatives may travel to Salem, Oregon in order to present information for this legislative committee.

Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest, noted that many residents of Olympia, Washington, were interested in the Tribal component of Hanford governance, as well as the Hanford Site's impact on climate change.

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch, said that he recently authored an article that will be featured in the Tri-City Herald's Hanford Progress Edition, planned for release in late March 2016.

Emily Peterson, Hanford Challenge, said that the group recently hosted a house party, featuring stories of Hanford whistleblowers. She noted that Hanford Challenge, in conjunction with HAB member Shannon Cram, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, provided the public with a presentation on worker safety at the University of Washington in Bothell, Washington. Hanford Challenge also received a curator tour of the *Black Lives at Hanford* photography exhibit at the Northwest African American Museum in Seattle, Washington. Emily closed by noting that Hanford Challenge had two new student interns in their office, and staff was working to educate them on Hanford issues.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, highlighted general concerns that she hears from members of the public, including concerns about whistleblower protections, how taxpayer money is spent, worker health and safety, the potential burden of toxicity to workers, WTP startup timelines, Long-Term Stewardship, preserving institutional memory at Hanford, environmental monitoring, treaty rights, telling the story of Hanford to the public, and clear communication between TPA agencies and the public.

Committee Business

PIC 3-Month Work Plan ²³

PIC will plan to hold a committee meeting prior to the April 2016 Board meeting. To prepare for this upcoming discussion, committee leadership will have a committee call in February 2016. PIC members identified that the upcoming April 2016 meeting would tentatively include the following topics:

- Receive an update from TPA agencies on Hanford public involvement (TPA Quarterly Planning Meeting)
- Receive an update on HAB-generated summaries of relevant reports, publications, and articles
- Discuss Hanford Site public involvement principles and determine the need for public involvement advice
- Receive a briefing or tutorial on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan
- Receive public involvement self-assessments from HAB members

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart notes

Attachment 3: PIC 3-Month Work Plan

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016
(February 2016)

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Attachment 3: PIC 3-Month Work Plan

DRAFT

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Richard Bloom | Gary Garnant | Kristen McNall |
| Don Bouchey | Becky Holland | Ken Niles |
| Jan Catrell | Steve Hudson | Emily Peterson |
| Sam Dechter | Susan Leckband | Helen Wheatley |
| Tom Galioto | Liz Mattson | |

Others:

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Kris Holmes, DOR-RL | Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology | Noah Cruz, CHPRC |
| Richard Buel, DOE-RL | Rochelle Twomey, Ecology | Sharon Braswell, North Wind/DOE-ORP |
| | Earl Fordham, WDOH | Katherine Bittinger, WSU |
| | | Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues |
| | | Brett Watson, EnviroIssues |